

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 2 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1 and 2 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 3 having a pressure-sensitive adhesive strength of 400gf/20 mm or less at 23°C after the adhesive tape being heated at 180°C. Claims 3-5 are canceled.

Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested along with reconsideration and review of the claims on the merits.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102/§ 103***

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as assertedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Aizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,609,954) for the reasons given in the Office Action.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as assertedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Aizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,441,810) for the reasons given in the Office Action.

As noted, Claim 3 is canceled. Thus, the rejection of Claim 3 is now moot.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)/103(a).

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

A. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over Mostafazadeh et al. in view of Lin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,273,938) as evidenced by High Performance Films for the reasons given in the Office Action.

Applicants respond as follows.

Applicants point out that Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the element of Claim 3 to recite “a pressure-sensitive adhesive strength of 400gf/20 mm or less at 23°C after the adhesive tape being heated at 180°C.” Applicants submit that neither Mostafazadeh et al. nor Lin et al. discloses or renders obvious at least this particular element. Accordingly, Claim 1 is patentable over the references to Mostafazadeh et al. and Lin et al.

As noted, Claim 4 is canceled, making the rejection of Claim 4 moot.

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of this obviousness rejection.

B. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mostafazadeh et al. in view of Lin et al. and High Performance Films as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Oida et al. (WO 98/35382) for the reasons given in the Office Action. The Examiner considers U.S. Patent 6,291,274 as an English language translation of Oida et al.

Applicants respond as follows.

Applicants point out that Claim 2 is also amended to incorporate the element of Claim 3 to recite “a pressure-sensitive adhesive strength of 400gf/20 mm or less at 23°C after the adhesive tape being heated at 180°C.” Applicants submit that Mostafazadeh et al. or Lin et al. or

Oida et al, separately or in combination thereof, does not disclose or render obvious at least this particular element. Accordingly, Claim 2 is patentable over the references to Mostafazadeh et al., Lin et al. and Oida et al.

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of this obviousness rejection.

C. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mostafazadeh et al. in view of Lin et al. and High Performance Films as applied to claims 1 and 4 above and further in view of Aizawa et al. '954 for the reasons given in the Office Action.

As noted, Claims 3 and 5 are canceled, making the rejection of these claims moot. However, Applicants note that a part of the subject matter of Claim 3 was added to Claim 1.

Applicants submit that neither Aizawa '810 nor Aizawa '954 are properly combinable with Mostafazadeh against the present invention. Applicants submit that Aizawa et al (US

5,609,954 and US 5,441,810) and Mostafazadeh et al belong to different technical fields.

Aizawa is directed to a strippable pressure-sensitive adhesive and an adhesive material using the same, and to an adhesive sheet. On the other hand, Mostafazadeh is directed to semiconductor technology where a molded plastic package incorporates a lead frame which includes a plurality of leads radially aligned around a central opening with an exposed die.

The combination of elements from non-analogous sources, in a manner that reconstructs the Applicants' invention only with the benefit of hindsight, is insufficient to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness. There must be some reason, suggestion, or motivation found in the

prior art whereby a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention would make the combination. That knowledge can not come from the Applicants' invention itself.

Considering the absence of suggestion in the prior art leading to this combination of references, along with the generally non-analogous fields of the prior art, Applicants submit that it is not obvious for a person skilled in the art to combine these references in different technical fields to achieve the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

### ***Conclusion***


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**  
U.S. Application No. 09/719,422

**Q62228**

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



John K. Shin  
Registration No. 48,409

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 16, 2004